

He also argued that controls have been ineffective in moderating inflation in other countries, and he was prone to point to the experience of the United States or of the Conservative Party in Britain. Why is the minister now trying to reach consensus? If voluntary controls are to work they will have the same effect as mandatory controls, and will cause the same distortion in the economy.

I do not believe that anyone can take what the minister is saying very seriously. He is saying that the working people whose wages are out in the open are the ones who have to toe the line, that they cannot have wage increases any higher than 12 per cent or \$2,400 a year, whichever is the lesser. That sort of position will discriminate against the person working as a janitor, or working as a waitress. It will discriminate against the ordinary working person of this country, but not against the man making \$20,000 a year, the member of parliament, the judge, the corporate executive, the lawyer, the doctor, or any other professional person earning fees.

● (1740)

I cannot take seriously any program which does not treat all Canadians equally, which does not have as its basic point and essential philosophy the notion of equality, the notion that we should narrow the gap between rich and poor, and redistribute income so that the low income person of this country will gain a greater share of our national wealth.

I notice, sadly, although with humour, that the minister forgot to tell us about interest rates. He forgot to talk about dividends, rents, and a number of other forms of income, because he represents the people in our country who get such income. He and the government govern for those people. He excludes interest rates because he thinks that the financial institutions can better look after them. He excludes dividends, because he thinks that we need large dividends in the private sector to stimulate the economy. These are things to which my party, a democratic socialist party, does not subscribe. We believe now that the priority is to stimulate the economy, to increase employment and beat inflation.

We need more production in the economy. We need to redistribute wealth so that ordinary, low income people will have a greater share of our national wealth. If we do this with significant tax cuts, these people can purchase goods and commodities, and we shall create jobs. We need to build houses; nothing stimulates employment more than the building of houses. We need to build 200,000 houses in addition to the ones already proposed or under construction. Building on this scale would stimulate the forest industry, the construction industry, and those industries which provide drapes, furnishings, carpets and other commodities which go into a house.

Our party also thinks that we need a national economic development plan under which the government, as the representative of the people, would do the planning and the investing instead of leaving this to the multinational corporations. That way we could invest according to our social priorities, not according to the dictates of the profit factor or the ledger. We would let the Canadian people make the decisions. Under such a plan our non-renewable resources would be placed under public ownership and

The Canadian Economy

developed by the provincial and federal governments. The Canadian people would control their own financial institutions, and decide what is really important for them.

We have to do this if the ordinary citizen is to share more equally in our national wealth. Surely it is the wish of the Canadian people, as it is of the NDP, to establish justice and equality in this country for one and all.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. It being 5.45 o'clock, it is my duty, pursuant to section 9(a) of Standing Order 58, to interrupt these proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the motion which is now before the House.

The question is on the amendment in the name of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment to the motion (Mr. Stanfield) which was negated on the following division:

● (1750)

(Division No. 48)

YEAS
Messrs.

Alkenbrack	Forrestall	MacKay
Andre	Fraser	MacLean
(Calgary Centre)	Gillies	Macquarrie
Baker	Halliday	Malone
(Grenville-Carleton)	Hamilton	Marshall
Baldwin	(Qu'Appelle-Moose	Masniuk
Balfour	Mountain)	Mazankowski
Beatty	Hamilton	McCleave
Benjamin	(Swift Current-	McGrath
Blackburn	Maple Creek)	McKenzie
Brewin	Hargrave	McKinley
Broadbent	Hees	McKinnon
Cadieu	Hnatyshyn	Munro
Carter	Holmes	(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Clark	Jarvis	Murta
(Rocky Mountain)	Jelinek	Neil
Clarke	Johnston	Nystrom
(Vancouver Quadra)	Kempling	Paproski
Cossitt	Knowles	Patterson
Crouse	(Winnipeg	Peters
Darling	North Centre)	Ritchie
Dinsdale	Knowles	Roche
Douglas	(Norfolk-Haldimand)	Rodriguez
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-	Lawrence	Rynard
The Islands)	MacDonald	Saltsman
Ellis	(Egmont)	Schellenberger
Elzinga	MacDonald (Miss)	Schumacher
Fairweather	(Kingston and the	Scott
Firth	Islands)	Skoreyko